

A STRUCTURE OF KNOWLEDGE AS A PRECEDENT TEXT FOR A PARODY

Muzafarova Luiza

Senior Lecturer, PhD Researcher
at Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

ABSTRACT:

According to the theory of intertextuality, elaborated by Julia Kristeva, every text, including literary ones, refers to another – precedent – text(s). Intertextual links may have various forms and include parody among others. Intertextuality has been usually considered in the framework of literary studies. Thus, this article suggests presenting the precedent text as a cognitive structure of knowledge which can be recognized with the help of parody. On the example of allusive texts from the stories of the Glass Family Series by J. D. Salinger, the author explores and demonstrates the mechanism of cognitive structure recognition, and comes to the conclusion that parody is being used as means of activating of cognitive structure of knowledge.

Keywords: intertextuality, inter text, precedent text, allusion, parody, fiction text, cognitive linguistics, structure of knowledge, J. D. Salinger, Glass Family.

INTRODUCTION:

In modern philology, the thesis that every text, primarily literary one, should be interpreted as an intertext, was firmly established 1970-1980s [Barthes 1989: 15]. Intertextuality is a multidimensional phenomenon and may be considered both at general (semiotic) and local (linguistic) levels. In relation to a literary text, intertextuality implies the presence in any text of direct and indirect references to specific pretexts, or precedent texts [Bezrukov 2005: 3].

The term "intertextuality", introduced in 1967 by the poststructuralist theorist Julia Kristeva, replaced the term of "intersubjectivity". Initially, the new term was related only to the analysis of a literary text and was considered as a means of analysis, but later it acquired a broader meaning and became the main concept of the aesthetic and philosophical system of poststructuralism [Allen 2006: 3].

Kristeva notes that any text is built as a mosaic of citation, any text is an absorption and transformation of some other text [Kristeva 2004: 312]. Thus, intertextuality is a dialogue of several texts, a text dialogue. The main idea of the theory of Kristeva boils down to the fact that the text in the process of intertextualization itself is constantly absorbed and transformed, creates and reinterprets. Therefore, this process is a guarantee of the openness of the text. As a result, intertextuality is elevated to the paradigm of an open and polyvalent text, and such an understanding of the phenomenon of text becomes important for a new intertextual way of narration?

MAIN PART:

Parody is being considered as one of the types of intertextual connections. Essentially, the parody has been studied from literary critics' point of view [Shklovsky 1983: 11; Verbitskaya 1987: 35; Mlechko 2000: 51-52]. In philological terms, parody is a prerequisite for "recognition" of a precedent text, as well as its reinterpretation, most often in an axiological sense [Sysoeva 2013: 330]. The aspect of reinterpretation, which is inherent for parody, allows us to consider this phenomenon from a

cognitive point of view, "since parody modifies the cognitive space of the prototext and contributes to changing existing ideas among readers" [Lushnikova 2010: 226].

However, a precedent text for a parody can be not only a familiar, a well-known literary work, i.e. a specific text, but also a certain type of discourse [see Eliseeva 2011: 34]. Indeed, any stereotyped discourse is in fact a fairly stable cognitive structure that can be identified due to the presence of labeled elements, in particular, phonetic features, lexical units, stylistic or rhetoric figures of speech, syntactic constructions. We believe that this statement is true for both individual and collective (ethnic, social, professional, etc.) discourse.

The purpose of this paper is to clarify the ways of detecting and interpreting intertextual parody in the space of a literary text. We proceed from the position that the text contains some markers which orient the reader to identify and recognize the precedent text in order to understand the allusive structure. At the same time, we consider as necessary to clarify the role of parody in a literary text not only from a philological, but also from a cognitive point of view. We suggest using a cognitive approach due to the fact that the identification of a parody is, in our opinion, not only a simple "recognition" of a precedent text, but also its re-interpretation, which requires the activation of cognitive structures of thinking.

Shot fictions by J.D. Salinger, telling the story of the Glass family, were chosen as the material for the analysis. These are stories that tell about the children from the Glass family – talented philosophers, poets, writers, actors, but very difficult individuals from a psychological point of view. The Glass Family Series is a genuine intertext for the stories are connected with each other by characters and

events, as well as the philosophical and religious problems that they raise. The texts of short stories are full of references to Eastern, ancient Indian, classical, Western European and Russian literature, Buddhist and Christian religious doctrines etc, which turns them into a real intertextual space.

Texts from the Glass Family Series are full of parody episodes, which we regard as a way to actualize the cognitive structure through intertextual connections. Now we will consider one of such examples found in the text of "Zooney" by J.D. Salinger.

After a long conversation with his mother, Zooney enters the living room, where his sister Franny is lying on the couch. She seems to wake up and begins to tell a dream she had, cf.:

"Oh, I had the most terrible dream," she said. [...]

"Go ahead," Zooney said, dragging on his cigar. "I'll interpret for you."

She shuddered. "It was just horrible. So spidery. I've never had such a spidery nightmare in my entire life."

"Spiders, eh? That's very interesting. Very significant. I had a very interesting person case in Zurich, some years back – a young very much like yourself, as a matter of fact –"

"Be quiet a second, or I'll forget it," Franny said. [...] "Oh, God, remember now!" she said. "It was just hideous. I was at a swimming pool somewhere, and whole bunch of people kept making me dive for can Medaglia d'Oro coffee that was on the bottom. [...]" Franny put her hands over her eyes briefly. "Whew!" She shook her head. She reflected. "The only person that made any sense the dream was Professor Tupper. I mean he was the only person that was there that know really detests me."

"Detests you, eh? Very interesting." Zooney's cigar was his mouth. He revolved slowly between his fingers, like dream

interpreter who isn't getting all the facts the case. He looked very contented. "Why does he detest you?" he asked. "Without absolute frankness, you realize, my hands are -"

"He detests me because I'm this crazy Religion seminar he conducts, and can never bring myself to smile back at him when he's being charming and Oxfordish. [...]"

"What was he doing at the pool?"

"That's exactly it! Nothing! Absolutely nothing! He was just standing around smiling and watching. He was the worst one there."

Zoey, looking at her through his cigar smoke, said dispassionately, "You look like hell. You know that?" [Salinger 253-255].

Zoey's remarks immediately attract reader's attention, both from the formal and from the substantive point of view. He actively uses lexical units and expressions that allow us to define his speech as a parody of the discourse of a psychoanalyst. So, after Franny's words that she had a nightmare, Zoey begins to play the role of a psychoanalyst who undertakes to interpret what she had seen in a dream as a manifestation of the subconscious, cf.: "I'll interpret for you". His remark "Go ahead" refers to the speech behavior of a doctor or psychoanalyst, who asks the patient to talk further. When Franny describes her dream as "spidery", Zoey repeats this word, thereby attracting attention to it and seems to fill it with a special meaning, cf.: "Spiders, eh? That's very interesting". Zoey, parodying the techniques of psychoanalysts, focuses on the self-characterization of Franny's dream – "Very significant", and then formulates a phrase that does not describe a real event, but would sound organically in the mouth of a psychoanalyst: "I had a very interesting person case in Zurich, some years back – a young very much like yourself, as a matter of fact –". When Franny mentions Professor Tupper from her dream, Zoey inserts again a remark that provides to

Franny's words a special sound - "Detests you, eh? Very interesting." The author draws attention to Zoey's gestures and his situational manner of speaking – he behaves and speaks "like a dream interpreter who isn't getting all the facts of the case". We believe that in this case we deal with a parody, which provides for the reader's "recognition" of the precedent text (discourse) by his/her own. The word combination "dream interpreter" is an indication or hint that helps to identify the parodied discourse. This is confirmed by his next unfinished remark - "Without absolute frankness, you realize, my hands are -", which is identified as typical for a psychoanalyst.

Throughout this episode, the author does not explicitly characterize Zoey's intonation, but we (readers) perceive them as ironic, also due to the fact that at the end of the episode Zoey speaks quite calmly – "said dispassionately", which means that his previous intonation was different – artificially enthusiastic, or interested.

Thus, we find that a parody can be realized by recreating the parodied text (discourse) by using specific, "recognizable" vocabulary and stereotyped expressions. These elements make it possible to identify the precedent discourse, even if it is not a specific text. An additional marker of parody is a special intonation of speech. The precedent discourse is identified due to its stereotyping, which indicates the possibility of defining it as a stable cognitive structure, and in this case parody acts as a means of actualizing of this structure.

CONCLUSION:

The examples of allusions and parodies provided are not exhaustive – the texts of the stories of the Glass Family Series are highly saturated with them. However, the analysis allows us not only to study the mechanism of

their formation in the text, but also to determine their role in the process of functioning of cognitive knowledge structures.

Thus, the comparative analysis allows us to come to the conclusion that allusion and parody should be interpreted not only as mechanical methods of intertextual linking of two texts, but as ways of actualizing the corresponding knowledge structures. As a result, the actualized knowledge structure often turns out to be broader than a specific case text, and a text fragment containing an allusion or parody includes some elements that allow for an adequate identification of the precedent text.

REFERENCES:

- 1) Allen G. Intertextuality. Routledge, 2006. – 238 p.
- 2) Barthes R. Semiotika. Poetika / R. Barthes Izbr. raboty [Semiotics. Poetics / R. Barthes. Selected works]. Moscow, Inostrannaya literatura Publ.1989.
- 3) Bezrukov A.N. Poetika intertekstual`nosti. Uchebnoe posobie [Poetics of Intertextuality. Handbook]. Birk: Birk. gos. socz.-ped. Akademiya Publ., 2005. – 70 p.
- 4) Eliseeva I.B. Diskursivny`e osobennosti teksta sovremennoj angloyazychnoj parodii. Avtoref. diss. ... kand. filol. nauk. [Discursive features of the text of a modern English-language parody]. Moscow, MGIMO Publ., 2011. - 34 p.
- 5) Kristeva J. Izbranny`e trudy. Razrushenie poetiki. [Selected works. The destruction of poetics]. Moscow, Rosspen Publ., 2004. – 656 p.
- 6) Lushnikova G. I. Kognitivny`e i lingvostilisticheskie osobennosti literaturnoj parodii. Avtoref. diss. ... dokt. filol. nauk. [Cognitive and linguistic-stylistic features of literary parody]. Kemerovo, Kemerovskij gos. un-t Publ., 2010. - 45 p.
- 7) Mlechko A.V. Igra, metatekst, trikster: parodiya v «russkix» romanax V.V. Nabokova [Game, metatext, trickster: a parody in the " Russian" novels by V.V. Nabokov]. Volgograd: Volga Publ., 2000. 188 p.
- 8) Shklovsky V.B. Iskusstvo kak priem. In: Shklovskij V.B. O teorii prozy. [Art as a technique. In: Shklovsky V. B. On the theory of prose]. Moscow, Higher School Publ., 1983. P. 9-26.
- 9) Sysoeva O. A. Literaturnaya parodiya: problema zhanra. In: Vestnik Nizhegorodskogo universiteta im. N. I. Lobachevskogo, №5, 2013. [Literary parody: the problem of genre]. Nizhny Novgorod, 2013. – P. 330-335.
- 10) Verbitskaya M.V. Literaturnaya parodiya kak obyekt filologicheskogo issledovaniya [Literary parody as an object of philological research]. Tbilisi, Novaya kniga Publ., 1987. - 166 p.
- 11) Salinger J.D. Nine stories. Franny and Zooey. Raise High the Roof Beam, Carpenters. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1982. 438 p.

Source of examples:

- 11) Salinger J.D. Nine stories. Franny and Zooey. Raise High the Roof Beam, Carpenters. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1982. 438 p.